



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,184	09/10/2003	Yadong Li	138543 (553-1077)	7486
45436	7590	08/20/2010		
DEAN D. SMALL				EXAMINER
THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP				MOTSINGER, SEAN T
225 S. MERAMEC, STE. 725T				
ST. LOUIS, MO 63105			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/20/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Docket@splglaw.com

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/659,184	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SEAN MOTSINGER	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED 02 August 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Bhavesh M Mehta/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive, applicant argues that because an element is missing a combination cannot teach this element. The examiner disagrees with this interpretation for multiple reasons. The combination of the references is considered not what each reference teaches individually. Furthermore what applicant is citing as "a element" is not really one element but multiple elements which can be cited in each reference. For example the claim require two different speckle reduction filters with different sets of parameters and the claim requires both filters being applied to one data stream. Wiesman disclose the two different speckle filters and Bloom discloses applying two different filters to one image i.e. Wiesman teaches the first element and bloom teaches the second. Applicant has cited a large chunk of claim language and argued as if it is one element that must be taught by one reference alone, when depending how the claim is broken down this section of the claim could be separated in to at least two if not more elements.

Applicant next argues argues that the two references lack a legitimate reason to be combined. More specifically applicant argues that Wiesman is concerned with diagnostic ultrasound imaging and reducing speckle noises, while Bloom is dealing with a digital camera which is concerned with variance in picture quality with respect to lighting conditions. The examiner strongly disagrees with applicants characterization of the references. Wiesman and Bloom are about filtering an image and giving a user options for adjusting the filtering of the image to provide an image the user finds the most suitable. The fact that the processing filters are different, and the type of images are different does not make the references non-analogous art. They are both trying to solve the problem of giving the user control over the filtering process to provide the filtering that is required for best view of the images. One of ordinary skill in the art would easily be able to recognize the utility of providing two differently filtered images to allow the user to select the "best" filtering operation in almost any image filtering operation as selecting appropriate filter strength is a problem throughout the image processing field.